

**MEANINGS AND CAUSES OF TERRORISM AND ITS
IMPLICATIONS AND THREATS FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE
AND STABILITY**

By

Oksana Hegay

THESIS

Submitted to
KDI School of Public Policy and Management
in partial Fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF PUBLIC POLICY
(Department of International Relations and Political Economy)

2006

**MEANINGS AND CAUSES OF TERRORISM AND ITS
IMPLICATIONS AND THREATS FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE
AND STABILITY**

By

Oksana Hegay

THESIS

Submitted to
KDI School of Public Policy and Management
in partial Fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF PUBLIC POLICY
(Department of International Relations and Political Economy)

Professor Ahn Byung-Joon

2006

ABSTRACT

‘MEANINGS AND CAUSES OF TERRORISM AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND STABILITY’

By

**Oksana Hegay
Master of Public Policy**

KDI School of Public Policy and Management, Seoul, 2006

Professor Ahn Byung-joon, Supervisor

"Terrorism" has become a catchword in the political debate after 11th September. It has been used in an inflationary manner and with different meanings. Terrorism is not a new phenomenon, though it has become more prevalent in parts of the world where formerly it was rare. It has been used most frequently in recent years in different parts of the World, as it is a widespread problem where any disaffected group that believes it can gain attention only through violence kills innocent civilians and destroys property to gain that attention.

How far the "war against terrorism" should go remains an open question. For political scientists researching terrorism, it is a phenomenon to be described as a political way of fighting, including the state terrorism or actions by liberation movements, without assessing them in political or ethical terms.

This thesis provides a broad outlook of various terrorist groups and its steams. It is not possible to lead a meaningful political and ethical debate about terrorism without specifying what the term actually includes. However, in this paper, I shall cover the causes of each individual action that is being called "terrorism," its dimensions, as well as its implications and threats for international peace and stability. Are there connections between Poverty, Cultural, Political, Religious terror actions, and terrorism versus Arabic fundamentalism? It soon becomes clear that a generalization, reducing the causes of "terrorism" to singular aspects such as poverty, religious fanaticism, ethnic conflict, political power struggles or the "mafia" plundering natural resources is problematic.

Dedicated to victims of terrorist actions

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to extend my heartfelt gratitude to the following individuals who, in one way or another, have shared their respective contributions for this paper to see the light of day.

To my thesis adviser, Professor Ahn Byung- Joon, for his precious time in going over the series of drafts, his insightful suggestions and inspiring comments.

To my loving parents and sister, to whom all I am enormously indebted and who is always a towering source of strength and inspiration;

Above all, I wish to express sincere appreciation to KDI School of Public Policy and Management, outstanding professors for providing me with valuable knowledge and remarkable experience during my stay in Korea.

In addition, special thanks are due to KDI School staff, whose familiarity with the needs and ideas of the community were helpful during the whole study period of this undertaking. I also thank my closest Korean and International friends for valuable input and enormous support and friendship during my stay in Korea.

I highly appreciate everyone's participation in my student life.

Oksana Hegay
Seoul, Korea. October 2006

Table of Contents

Preface	7
 CHAPTER I ORIGINS OF TERRORISM	
Problem statement and definitions	9
The roots and nature of the terrorism, why it matters?	12
 CHAPTER II ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES TO TERRORISM	
Religious and Cultural causes of terrorism or Islamic Fundamentalism?	18
Determining Power terrorism: political causes of terrorism	25
Do Socioeconomic Factors generate terrorism?	32
 CHAPTER III TERRORISM'S IMPLICATONS AND THREATS FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND STABILITY	
Conclusions and the model of analysis of terrorist influential factors.	38
Counterterrorism Policies and Strategies	48
The List of Foreign Terrorist Organizations	55
References	

PREFACE

Any human being, regardless of his ethnic and religious origin, will never think of carrying out such a violent, evil attack. Whatever its purpose is, this action cannot be justified and tolerated.

Mehmet Nuri Yılmaz

In a global context, while successive regimes have tried to address and then root out the evil of terrorism, the latest efforts spearheaded by the United States, show that many who engage with the problematics of terrorism do not really know what they are dealing with, or the implications of what they are doing to address it. Fighting against terrorism has become the facetious couture of a seemingly bi-polar world, which is either with terrorists or against them. The reality is somewhat different. Although legislation in many countries purportedly addresses terrorism, very few have dared define the word.

People have to understand that violence, including terrorism by the state, rarely stops further violence as long as underlying societal grievances are not addressed. Furthermore, definitions of terrorism must tread warily between restricting the freedoms of the individual with legal provisions required to guard against the contingencies and imperatives confronting the state and the primary necessity to protect democratic processes without excessive intrusion in to the private domain of the individuals. Maintaining the democratic process, which is the ultimate guarantor of individual liberties and human rights, must be uppermost in any definition of terrorism.¹

Political, social and economic probably religious aspirations of peoples which, when frustrated continuously, give rise to full blown terrorism of modern day, must be sifted out of the process of terrorist actions and looked at separately— that dominant power structures rarely address the conflict with a commitment to find the underlying causes for terrorism. The ramifying evil of terrorism, according to Michael Walzer, is not just the killing of innocent

¹ See H.L.D. Mahindapala, *Defining Terrorism*

people but also the intrusion of fear into everyday life, the violation of private purposes, the insecurity of public spaces and the endless coerciveness of precaution.² He also argues against a fundamental principle of terrorism – that it is the last resort of an underprivileged and discriminated peoples to over-turn and change dominant political structures. The overwhelming salience of a coherent definition of terrorism must also address the wider socio-economic issues that give rise to terrorism.

The objectives of the study are to better understand and compare the nature and varieties of terrorist activities, to identify those origins or contextual factors as poverty, cultural, religious, economic, political ones, that might explain differences and similarities in the ways those different streams of discussion approach policy problems related to terrorism itself, to draw tentative conclusions about the implications of terrorism for international peace and stability.

Some recommendations in fighting the major enemy of the 21st century as well as counterterrorist techniques will be covered in this paper and conclusion will be drawn on the basis of overall research results.

² Michael Walzer, 'Excusing Terror', *The American Prospect*, Vol. 12 No. 18, 2001.

CHAPTER I: ORIGINS OF TERRORISM.

Problem statement and definitions

While the problem posed by terrorism has received serious global attention, the international community has not yet formulated a uniform definition of terrorism.

Terror is a highly subjective experience and everyone has different limits and reasons for feeling frightened of certain experiences and images. One definition of terror is the unintended or derived by-product of other events that are beyond our power to predict or to control. It is a special means or method of conflict, which has been employed by a wide variety of factions and regimes. It is premeditated and systematic, and aims to create a climate of extreme fear or terror. The modern words “*terror*” and “*terrorism*” are derived from the Latin verb “*terrere*”, to cause, to tremble, and “*deterre*”, to frighten from.

Legal statutes regard terrorism as a crime. Yet there is considerable variation in how these laws define terrorism. The U.S. federal statute defines terrorism as “violent acts or acts dangerous to human life that appear to be intended to intimidate or coerce a civilian population, to influence the policy of a government by intimidation or coercion or to affect the conduct of a government by assassination or kidnapping.”³

The FBI defines terrorism as “the unlawful use of force or violence against persons or property to intimidate or coerce a government, the civilian population, or any segment thereof, in furtherance of political or social objectives.”

According to Paul Wilkinson, a professor at the University of St. Andrews and an expert in the study of terrorism since the early 1970s, terrorism is the systematic use of coercive intimidation, usually to achieve political ends, and it is used to create and to exploit a climate of fear among a wider target group than the immediate victims of the violence, and to publicize a

³ United States Code, Title 18, Section 2331 (18 USC 2331).

cause, as well as to coerce a target to accept the terrorist's goals⁴.

Terrorism concerns the use of murder and destruction and threat of murder and destruction because one way for terrorists to achieve their demands is to terrorize all individuals and governments. Even though there is no agreed upon detailed definition for terrorism, as to its character or type of operation, most experts agree that the element of fear is important to the determination of that phenomenon. Additional characteristics of the terrorist groups are ruthlessness, disregard for established humanitarian values, and a limitless quest for publicity through the mass media.

The most common methods that are used by terrorists to achieve their goals are hijacking, hostage taking, bombings, assassinations and mass murders. Common criminals might use terrorist attacks such as ransom or revenge, just to succeed in their vile goals. The popularity of terrorism among the nationalists, ideological, and religious extremists might simply be their desire to express their hatred and desire for revenge.

Terrorism is usually divided into two basic types: factional terrorism, which assumes international goals, and national or politically motivated terrorism, which focuses on forcing changes solely in a particular state⁵. The distinction entails terrorist groups that are either internationally or nationally motivated.⁶

Internal terrorism is restricted to national territory, and international terrorism is an attack beyond international borders, and even on a foreign target. Of course, in our modern world, terrorist attacks usually have international dimensions, and they are not confined to a single state or region. Law enforcement agencies have much more ability to control internal

⁴Paul Wilkinson, *Terrorism versus Democracy: The Liberal State Response*, Frank Cass Publishers, 2001, p.12

⁵Graham Evans and Jeffrey Newnham, *The Penguin Dictionary of International Relations*. 531

⁶Paul Wilkinson, *Terrorism versus Democracy: The Liberal State Response*, p. 13 terrorists because they have the resources, authority and jurisdiction over their own nation.

Terrorism and its actions are not part of a philosophy or a political movement, but are only methods of conflict and of war. Yet even in these cases, actions like killings and bombings were not morally justified, as the basic rights of innocent citizens were in danger. The paradox is that even with tremendously lethal attacks, the terrorists' goals have rarely been successful and terrorist attacks alone have not been able to overthrow democracies or even repressive regimes.

In general, terrorism as a method of warfare has the following salient characteristics:

a) There are no inherent concerns about the after effects of terrorist attacks, b) Terrorism is mainly arbitrary and unpredictable, in the minds of its victims and audience, and in its effects upon individuals and society, c) Terrorism implicitly denies the recognition of all rules, principles and international conventions of war, d) Terrorists reject all moral constraints, which is reflected in the use of terrible and dreadful weapons.⁷

Terrorists believe that they act according to a higher revolutionary morality that justifies all their actions, even actions that are essentially not much different from the actions of common criminals. They pay no attention to the generally accepted humanitarian principles and values and with much defiance and pride; they place themselves above and outside moral law. As concerns written law, they believe it to be a creation of the ruling class, an "international conspiracy" against their rights, their country, and their interests in general.

Many more efforts at defining terrorism may be found, but terrorism is too complex to grasp with definitions such as those offered.

⁷Paul Wilkinson, *Terrorism and the Liberal State*, pp. 53-54.

The roots and the nature of terrorism, why it matters?

Experts agree that there is almost always a strategy behind terrorist actions. Whether it takes the form of bombings, shootings, hijackings, or assassinations, terrorism is neither, random, spontaneous, nor blind; it is a deliberate use of violence against civilians for political or religious ends.

What are the roots of terrorism? There appear to be at least three schools of thought about the sources of terrorism. The first, and most primitive, posits that terrorism is simply a product of the religion and culture. The second posits that terrorism is a consequence of authoritarianism, stagnation, and repression, and therefore democratic reform of these authoritarian societies is the key to ending systemic terror, i.e. power terrorism. The third school posits that terrorism is the result of economic inequality and poverty.

According to some historical data, more than 2,000 years ago, Jewish Zealots assassinated their targets, the Roman occupiers, in broad daylight, often in crowded market places or on feast days. This was done to convey their message to the Roman occupiers and their Jewish sympathizers and collaborators. Between 1090 and 1272, the Assassins used similar tactics against the Christian Crusaders. And until the French Revolution (1789-99), terrorism was justified mainly by religion. This situation changed, however, as nationalism, anarchism, Marxism, and other secular political movements emerged during the 1800s. Modern terrorism, initially antimonarchical, was embraced by rebels and constitutionalists during the late stages of the French Revolution and in Russia by the “People’s Will” organization (1878-81). The revolutionary, antigovernment orientation of this latter group became the model for future terrorists.

Later on the word terrorism was used to describe the wanton violence and intimidation inflicted by the Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy, and the totalitarian USSR. Recent history records the use of such measures by the military dictatorships of Argentina, Chile, and Greece during the 1970s. During the late 1960s and 1970s, various disenfranchised or exiled nationalist minorities embraced terrorism to draw attention to their plight and generate international support. During the late 1960s and early 1970s, North and South American, as well as western European, political extremists began to form terrorist groups that opposed American.

As for the nature of modern terrorism, it could be exhibited in the following elements: In the past, terrorists tried to influence decision-makers and their policies through a policy known as individualized terrorism – political assassinations and other direct action against government personnel. The assassinations were effective means, particularly in authoritarian regimes to replace government leaders and bring about change in policy. However, due both to the process of modernization and to the spread of democracy, violent political organizations have had to adapt their tactics to a changing environment. Rather than acting against policy-makers directly, they began to focus on pressuring public opinion and spreading fear among citizens with the aim of achieving their political objectives.

This type of terrorism, indiscriminate terrorism, owes its development to a number of technological innovations, which, in the twentieth century, provided fruitful ground for the spread of modern terrorism. The acts of terror which involve suicide bombings and hostage taking are profoundly modern phenomena and reflect global changes in the development of terrorism worldwide. Such changes challenge the old definitions of terrorism and warrant new insights which, while defining terror, should refrain from subjectivity and bias and touch upon underlying causes of modern terrorism.⁸

⁸Boaz Ganor: "Defining Terrorism: Is One Man's Terrorist, Another Man's Freedom Fighter?" 1998, p 5

Modern terrorism grew in step with the development of innovative weapons and modern means of transportation. Innovations in weapons technology has made lethal weapons smaller and more portable, and much more difficult to detect. Mass transportation has become faster, yet more vulnerable. Commercial air transport has come to be seen as the “sort underbelly” of the transport industry, offering many opportunities for attack by terrorist, while by the same token, providing a swift means of escape for perpetrators of attacks. But most of all, modern terrorism has profited from the development and spread of modern mass media, and electronic communication in particular.

Of foremost importance is television. The facility for live broadcasts and the transfer of information in real time, and in color, via satellite, all over the world, along with the multiplicity of communications channels have provided modern terrorists with the useful tools for “selling their message.” They can carry out horrific attacks and transmit their message to the general public with great speed and emphasis.

In broad terms, its causes usually can be traced to political oppression, cultural domination, economic exploitation, ethnic discrimination, and religious persecution. Terrorism can be distinguished from other violence by being systematic, deliberate, and sustained over time; it is not spontaneous or purely expressive, as some other forms of civil violence, riots maybe. The terrorist is not driven by personal desires or ambitions.⁹ Engagement in terrorism usually requires a sustained commitment, which the individual must be able to justify in terms of society values and aspirations. Many individual terrorists need to feel virtuous or altruistic. Because terrorism is explicitly justified by those who use it in terms of widely held social values, it differs fundamentally from family or criminal violence. It makes an explicit claim to political relevance.

⁹Declaration on Terrorism by the 8th ASEAN summit see: [<http://www.aseansec.org/13154.html>]

Emotions may influence commitments, but they are controlled and channeled through collective decision-making processes that give motivations an ideological cast.

Terrorists may see themselves acting as representatives of groups within society, defending and preserving an identity, or preventing the assimilation of a religious or ethnic community into an alien society that would dilute its values and traditions. Users of terrorism may think of themselves as bringing about a better society for all, thus acting in the interest of a collective good, not as a selfish contender for power in a narrow political arena.

Terrorism is indiscriminate, in that people killed are not targeted specifically and are of no account to the terrorist; however, the fact that people are killed is of consequence.

This kind of action is not an irrational act. The targets are chosen because they will cause the desired impact either the disruption of infrastructure, causing massive death, or disruption of society. The nature of modern terrorism is that anyone can be a victim and terrorism is not random, but causes public anxiety and fear and changes in behavior, which are exactly what the terrorist wants to accomplish. It is also a public act. The act must be such that the greater society will see it and react to the attack. The terrorist may choose targets that have symbolic value or economic value: WTC for example, or targets that have public value like buses, restaurants etc., in order to gain public attention and to change public behavior.¹⁰

The word “Terrorism” should not be confused with traditional warfare. In war, the target is selected for its military value.

¹⁰Ibid

In war, groups of people are selected for attack because the people themselves have some specific values and attacking the group will achieve specific military objectives.

An example of war crime is an army advancing into some town with the objective of purging the town of enemy forces, and while doing so they kill unarmed civilians and noncombatants. Although such action is illegal and a crime, it is not considered terrorism; people were killed because destruction was designed to intimidate other towns or the society as the whole. In distinguishing the difference between war and terrorism, the focus is on the reason for the attack and the impact of the attack, not the target of the attack itself. The objective can be to force the government to negotiate or seek revenge for some government action. Therefore, terrorism should be understood as an act to achieve a desired goal through the use of violence. The terrorist does not act for personal gain or gratification, thus the terrorist is not a criminal in the traditional sense. Terrorism does not seek specific victims but it does seek out specific targets for a specific outcome. Its concept used in the contemporary academic literature is essentially political.

What about the use of terrorism in the name of religious causes? It is true that militant religious fundamentalists have often throughout history waged holy terror as part of a holy war, and there is much concern about the rise of contemporary fanatical Islamic fundamentalists groups such as Hizbollah, Hamas, and Al-Gama'a Al Islamiyya and Al-Qaeda. But the major reason why moderate Muslim leaders and secular movements see these particular fundamentalist groups as such a threat is precisely because their revolutionary Islamic agenda aims not merely at the purifying of religious practice but at the overthrow of existing governments and their replacement by fundamental theocracies. Hence these movements are inherently religious and political.

Another important principle that astute thinkers have pointed out repeatedly in our time is the distinction between non-governmental forms of terrorism and state-sponsored terrorism.

Human beings have come to understand that nation-states also engage in terrorism. It becomes more and more difficult to distinguish between private terrorism and terrorism routinely engaged in by nation-states.

State terrorism is often understood in the literature as being the mirror of private terrorism, since it is the use of state military power to enforce a system resulting in extreme poverty for the majority, exploitation, imperial domination, and humiliation that states, groups or regions impose on others. Thus, terrorism's success is best measured by its ability to attract attention to the terrorists and their cause and by its psychological impact.

As the experience with Osama bin Laden, a rogue Saudi businessman with extreme Islamist and anti-American views, suggests, the future environment may see more international terrorism financed by private means. Private sponsors of terrorist movements, not necessarily limited to Islamic radicalism and with full access to information technologies and techniques, may find it convenient to operate against regimes, rival movements, or the United States from far-flung bases.

And as the bin Laden experience shows, targets will include the relatively "hard" the U.S. overseas military presence as well as softer diplomatic and civilian targets. Bin Laden established himself in Afghanistan, along with other Arab Afghans, whereas Sudan offers another congenial environment.¹¹

¹¹After the Khobar Towers bombing, bin Laden issued explicit calls for a holy war against U.S. forces in the Gulf. Robert Fisk, "Saudi Calls for Jihad Against U.S. 'Crusader'," *The Independent*, September 2, 1996; and report interview with bin Laden in Afghanistan, *The Independent*, July 10, 1996. The full text of the declaration was published in *Al-Islah* (London), FBIS-NES-96-173, September 2, 1996. 108 "Countering the New Terrorism".

In the future, bases for privately sponsored terrorism might as easily be found in unstable regions elsewhere— in the Balkans or the Caucasus, or where wealthy elites exist against a background of strong anti-Western resentment, such as Malaysia. Arguably, the decline in overt state sponsorship may stimulate the rise of privately sponsored terrorism—the dark side of global philanthropy. There are numbers of functional features which a viable ideational doctrine must invoke to mobilize opposition to predatory authoritarian governance.

Suicide attacks differ from other terrorist operations, because the perpetrator's own death is a requirement for success. Suicide bombers, therefore, are typically highly motivated, passionately dedicated individuals who decide voluntarily or upon persuasion to surrender their lives to fulfill their mission. They, lacking a means of self-defense, have increasingly resorted to the tactic to keep pressure on the occupation forces.

Terrorists typically justify their acts by citing exclusion from, or frustration with, the accepted processes of engendering political change. They maintain that their actions are the only option left, although their choice is a reluctant even a regrettable one. This action enables the weak to confront the strong, and thus has an enduring appeal to those who are dissatisfied with the status quo. In addition, a relatively inexpensive action can have spectacular results, as it could have been seen in the aftermath of September 11.

Although various hypotheses about the causes of terrorism have been proposed, a number of important factors have been largely ignored. Geopolitics, especially rich-world attempts to control oil, help incite terrorist attacks on the rich by people from developing countries. But demographic and socio-economic factors, especially poverty, inequality and large numbers of young men facing dim economic prospects, also are likely contributors to such terrorism.

Death-roll-> Death-toll in the acts of terrorism in 1994—2004			
Place in a rating	Country	On the territory of the country in 1994-2004	On 1 million inhabitants of the country
1	USA	3238	11,05
2	Russia	2111	14,54
3	India	1928	1,81
4	Israel	1274	219,3*
5	Columbia	1135	26,82
6	Iraq	1122	44,22
7	Alger	869	27,05
8	Pakistan	783	4,92
9	Urganda	471	17,84
10	Sri-Lanka	409	20,55

Without taking into account the population of the Western coast of the river Jordan and Gaza Strip.¹²

I have made a careful research about the variable causes of terror and defined my own understanding of roots of terrorism. This leads us to the next chapter, where I have described some alternatives approaches to terrorism where I will try to discover the causes of terrorism on examples of political, religious and poverty factors.

¹²On data of the newspaper "Businessman", on September, 13th 2004

CHAPTER II ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES TO TERRORISM

Religious and Cultural causes of terrorism or Islamic Fundamentalism?

In this sub-chapter I am going to find out whether Religious factor creates terrorism or somehow promotes its existence.

While “religion” is generally associated with “goodness,” many people consider that religion and terrorism share a long history.

The English word *assassin* comes from a Shiite Muslim sect Nizari Isma’ilis – also known as *hashashins* or “hashish-eaters,” who fought Sunni Muslims (1090–1275), and during medieval Christendom resisted occupation during the Crusades (1095–1291). They were known to spread terror through murder, their victims including women and children.

Religious terrorists seek to use violence to further what they see as divinely commanded purposes, often targeting broad categories of foes in an attempt to bring about sweeping changes. Religious terrorists come from many major faiths, as well as from small cults.

Because religious terrorists are concerned not with rallying a constituency of fellow nationalists or ideologues but with pursuing their own vision of the divine will, they lack one of the major constraints that historically has limited the scope of terror attacks, experts say".

Today, at least twenty percent of the approximately fifty known terrorist groups active throughout the world can be described as having a dominant religious component or motivation. Admittedly, many contemporary terrorist groups such as the Provisional Irish Republic Army, their Protestant counterparts in Northern Ireland, the Palestine Liberation Organization, various Armenian terrorist movements, and both the Tamil Tigers and J.V.P. in Sri Lanka have a strong religious element. But the political aspect is the dominant characteristic of these groups, as evidenced by the preeminence of their nationalist or irredentist aims.

Terrorism has been a favored tactic for violent confrontations across religious fault lines within and between states, whether in Kashmir, the former Yugoslavia, Egypt, or Sudan.

Among Palestinians, Bosnians, Chechens, Sikhs, and others, politicized religious movements have played a key role in the evolution of political violence and have emerged as a geopolitical force¹³. There is little evidence that terrorism is losing its salience in this setting. The approach of the millennium has significance for a variety of religious and transcendental groups. The result could be an even more potent tendency toward nihilist and transcendental violence which has accompanied the end of previous centuries. Extremist millenarians and other groups on the pattern of the Aum Shinrikyo cult in Japan may well wish to “give history a shove” through acts of super-terrorism with weapons of mass destruction, and the U.S. and other Western societies generally may offer especially symbolic targets.

Such groups may also be among the most likely to envision transnational acts of destruction and disruption. Groups motivated by apocalyptic impulses, together with the maturing of more traditional politically oriented terrorist movements, suggest the rise of what Walter Laqueur has described as “postmodern terrorism.”

The most extreme religious terrorists can sanction “almost limitless violence against a virtually open-ended category of targets: that is, anyone who is not a member of the terrorists’ religion or religious sect.” Another question appears: Is that Religious aspect that most of terrorist actions were caused by Muslim fundamentalists and extremists rather than any other religions? Well, that’s true that most of Muslims are not terrorists but most terrorists are Muslims.

¹³See Magnus Ranstorp, “Terrorism in the Name of Religion,” *Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 50, No. 1, Summer 1996; and Mark Juergensmeyer, “The Worldwide Rise of Religious Nationalism,” *Journal of International Affairs*, Vol. 50, No. 1, Summer 1996. 102 “Countering the New Terrorism”.

Many people argue that with the rise of the Ayatollah Khomeini in Iran in 1979, religious-based terrorism returned. Militant Islam and the protection of Islam against Jews, Christians and the West, specifically the United States, formed an independent, so called the Israeli–Arab/Palestinian conflict, justification for terrorism. And that the last decade of the twentieth century provided the most recent change in the development of terrorism.

The Cold War, for its part, helped ignite the growth of a new Islamic fundamentalist movement. As the United States and the Soviet Union divided the world into separate spheres of influence, Islamic dissidents increasingly viewed both superpowers as godless, soulless empires. American support of wealthy, corrupt royal families in the Middle East outraged many Arabs and Muslims who, as they assumed, contrasted the poverty of their own people with the extreme wealth flaunted by their leaders. By the 1970s, a new Islamic fundamentalism began to challenge the U.S. backed Middle Eastern leaders who had protected American access to oil. Unexpectedly, the war transformed a generation of fundamentalist idealists into a disciplined network of terrorists. Unlike earlier Arab nationalists, these religious fundamentalists embraced a deeply reactionary, anti-modernist, view of the world.

Rooming hugely over the landscape of contemporary Islamic Fundamentalism and Extremism, as for at least the past three decades has been a militant Jihad-based ideology, profoundly hostile or religious tolerance or pluralism of any kind that has been given the name of “Islamism.” Its specific roots have been traced by some scholars to wahhabism, a puritanical and xenophobic tendency that arose in the 18th century and flourishes in modern-day Saudi Arabia, where is embraced, subsidized, enforced and propagated by the regime.¹⁴

¹⁴ipg Kitschelt, *Origins of Terrorism* 185 1/2004

The goal of this ideology is to establish an extreme totalitarian regime in all Muslim and to extend dominion outward to the free and open societies of the West when are special objects of its atavistic rage and none more than the U.S.A also known as the great Satan.

Before defining Religious terrorism, it is essential to differentiate between Islamic fundamentalism and Islamic Extremism, as nowadays many terrorist actions are presumed to take place mainly because of Fundamentalism and Extremism. Like any other religious Islamic fundamentalism endorses religious education and the strict observance of religious traditions in everyday life.

The goal of Islamic extremists is to use force to impose what they consider an Islamic government model on state and society to enforce Islamic rules of behavior in public and private life by violent means. Extremism has emerged from within Islam not because the religion itself gave rise to it, but as a result of the rise of several Islamic sects, some of which espouse values that are far from the mainstream. An example of a sect is “Wahhabism,” whose beliefs are the justification for the illegal activities of many extremists.

Islamic fundamentalism’s influence is also strengthened by reaction to the more blatant expressions of western culture that are perceived as eroding many of society’s moral underpinnings. Islamic fundamentalism can reject the extremist movement once and for all and turn toward a variant of democracy that embraces traditional Islamic values. Likewise, the equation of Islamic fundamentalism with extremism would be encouraged by the world’s division into two civilizations, by the juxtaposition of Islam against the rest of the world’s community.

Al-Qaeda, the network of Islamist terrorists that the United States says was behind the terror attacks, subscribes to a militant form of Islam that seeks to rid The Middle East of all Western influence and establish an Islamist state. Al-Qaeda and like-minded extremists believe that violence, including killing civilians, is justified as a means to restore *sharia* i.e. Islamic

law and maintain Islamic cultural identity. Above all, such doctrines must promise a new communitarian unity to combat economic and political individualism and its correlates, alienation and anomie. Of course, in a number of countries more narrowly defined ethno cultural concerns have inspired civil wars, and domestic acts of terrorism.

One might recall Sri Lanka or Peru, to name only two conflicts prominently featured in international news media.

To become more than local struggles, however, they would have to connect to a broad, generalized, universalistic ideology. In Latin America, at least, this link usually still goes to latter-day variants of dependency theory, such as among the intellectuals guiding the Indio movement in Chiapas/Mexico or in the Peruvian highlands.

Terrorism as a strategy with which to articulate dissatisfaction with an incumbent regime in fact signals the failure of challengers to rally broad popular support around alternatives to the political status quo. The prevalence of Islam in a polity is neither a sufficient nor a necessary condition of the willingness of a revolutionary cadre to engage in terrorist violence against the West.

It is unclear; however, what other ideational visions could guide insurrectional activities and ultimately terrorism, where fundamentalist Islam is not a viable option. Thus, while ideology is indispensable for the guidance of struggles for political power and control, it would be wrong to characterize any particular world religious civilization as more or less prone to a particular kind of democratic or authoritarian rule.

My personal opinion is that it is not the intention of Islam to force its beliefs on people, but Islam is not merely 'belief'. As I have pointed out, Islam is a declaration of the freedom of man from servitude to other men. Thus it strives from the beginning to abolish all those systems and governments which are based on the rule of man over men and the servitude of one human being to another.

When Islam releases people from this political pressure and presents to them its spiritual message, appealing to their reason, it gives them complete freedom to accept or not to accept its beliefs. However, this freedom does not mean that they can make their desires their gods, or that they can choose to remain in the servitude of other human beings, making some men lords over others.

The association of Islam with authoritarian and predatory rule in the Middle East – and nowhere else to the same degree and intensity – is the result of political and economic conditions and institutional legacies unique to this region, but not derivative from Islam in general. Both regime incumbents and challengers in this region employ religious arguments to frame their own claims and persuade individuals and groups to join their struggle. However, it is conceivable that insurrectional actors invoke non-Islamic religious or secular ideological justifications of their struggles in other world regions where predatory rule causes severe social grievances and challengers find political opportunities to attack regime incumbents.

Determining Power terrorism

Although there is no adequate scientific or objective understanding of political terrorism, its definition could be given as a form of terrorism, a tactic of violence that targets civilians, used to influence socio-political events so that gains occur that might not have otherwise happened by peaceful means or by conventional warfare, mainly the purpose of political terrorists seek to enrich themselves.

There are several types of political terrorism which could be observed nowadays: at times, national governments have aided terrorists to further their own foreign policy goals.

So-called state-sponsored terrorism, however, falls into a different category altogether, for it is considered a form of covert warfare, a means to wage war secretly through the use of terrorist

surrogates as hired guns. Such sponsorship has proven invaluable to some terrorist organizations, for it allows them to obtain arms, money, and a safe haven, among other things, and thereby become more powerful and menacing opponents. It also can place at terrorists' disposal the resources of an established country's diplomatic, military, and intelligence services, and thereby improve the training of terrorists and facilitate planning and operations. Finally, governments have paid terrorists handsomely for their services which enable them to present a greater threat to their opponents.

Revolutionary or Ideological terrorism is described as the use of systemic, terrorist violence to bring about a revolution. It has its origins in reactionary ideas, and in the purported cycles in human societies that rotate the allocation of power. These terrorists seek to change the entire political social and economic system either to an extreme left or extreme right model. In the 1970's and 1980's studies of ideological terrorism focused on the extreme left, because of the preoccupation with groups such as the Red Army Faction in Germany and the Red Brigades in Italy. Yet, as Walter Laqueur observes in his magisterial general history of terrorism, the dominant ideological orientation of European terrorism between the world wars was fascist.¹⁵ And it is neo-Nazi and neo-fascist groups that are behind so much of the racist and anti-immigrant violence in present day Germany and other European countries. The Red Army groups so active during the 1970's and 1980's have now largely faded away, the victims of their own internal splits, determined law enforcement by their respective police and judicial authorities, and changing political attitudes amongst young people in the post-Cold War era.

¹⁵Walter Laqueur, *Terrorism*, London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson, 1977.

However, in Latin America and parts of Asia and Africa extreme left organizations using terrorism remain significant challenges to governments.

Next type of terrorism is against totalitarian states. A totalitarian state is one which not only outlaws what it forbids, but which tries to control the minds of its subjects, and to strike fear into their hearts with the use of secret police.

The success of an attempt to indoctrinate the public mind with the story of a particular regime explains the isolation that the internal dissident faces in a totalitarian nation, and also the ferocity with which the individuals of an invaded country will, at first, resist their invader.

As for the sub-revolutionary terrorism, it is seen as the violence that is motivated by political and social concerns other than the ouster of a government, for desired legislation, or simply in vengeance for governmental intervention into a particular way of life. Its origins lie in feuding groups who took the law into their own hands to defend their resources and in assassinations i.e. the wiping out of political rivals.

Another type of political terrorism is repressive terrorism i.e. the use of systematic, centralized violence to suppress, put down, and restrain certain groups, such as dissidents, or even an entire population. It is considered always unpredictable and arbitrary. State agents, and informers support the tyrannical rule, whose harsh methods, such as the use of torture and liquidation, and purges, strikes fear into a population.

Single Issue terrorist groups are obsessed with their desire to change a specific policy or practice within the target society, rather than with the aim of political revolution. Examples include the violent animal rights and anti-abortion groups.

Most frequently cited examples of religio - political terrorists are groups such as

Hizbollah and Hamas. Osama bin Laden's al-Qaeda network is clearly religio-political. At its core his agenda is political though it is dressed up in language of Islamic holy war¹⁶. But it is important to bear in mind that militant fundamentalist factions of major religions other than Islam have also frequently spawned their own violent extremist groups. Striking examples can be found among Sikhs, Hindus, and Jews, and there is a well documented link between certain Christian fundamentalist groups and extreme right-wing terrorism in North and Central America. Most frequent type of political terrorism is against foreign rule; example could be The United Kingdom after World War II, tried to manage the transition from imperial rule with a low profile¹⁷. Recourse to terrorism was the exception and not the rule for anti-colonialist struggles in The British Empire.

Groups seeking independence from British colonial rule were many; most such nationalists achieved independence through political pressure and negotiation. And nowadays we can observe the situation in The Middle East.

Political causes of terrorism

Perceived inequities in the distribution of wealth and political power have led some terrorists to attempt to overthrow democratically elected governments. To achieve a fairer society, they would replace these governments with socialist or communist regimes.

Germany's Baader-Meinhof Gang, Italy's Red Brigades, and the Weather Underground in the U.S. worked for this aim.

¹⁶Rohan Gunaratna, "Inside Al-Qaeda", London: CSTPV-Hurst Series on Political Violence, 2002, Chapter 2.

¹⁷See Jeffrey Kaplan, 'Right-Wing Violence in North America', in Tore Bjorgo (ed.) "Terror from the Extreme Right", London: Frank Cass, 1995.

Some seek to fulfill what they consider a divinely inspired or millennialist cause, which was related to the end of the world. The Japanese religious cult Aum Shinrikyo, responsible for a nerve gas attack on the Tokyo subway in 1995, falls into this category. Others embrace comparatively more defined and comprehensible goals, such as re-establishing a national homeland or unifying a divided nation or opposing legalized abortion or nuclear energy.

Some thoughtful people can doubt that one probable factor was geopolitical, the historic behavior of Western nations in The Middle East. That behavior has been designed in large part to assure the abundant, uninterrupted flows of petroleum upon which developed nations have become dependent. That's why there are American troops in Saudi Arabia, whose presence has engaged some Moslems, especially Osama Bin Laden.

But oil alone can't explain the atrocity of the terrorists' attacks. The persistence of non-democratic governments, often supported by Western powers, certainly, may be a factor in increasing instability in Muslim nations. But it is hard to know what role that lack of political freedom might play in the generation of international terrorism. It seems likely to be a cause largely to the degree that western intervention in the cause of oil is perceived as a factor supporting corrupt, autocratic rulers.

So, this type of terrorism can be considered as actions carried out by militarily-weak sub- or trans-national groups from developing nations to gain political ends through violence against private citizens or public property of military-powerful developed nations. Few Muslim clerics advocate the radical form of Islam espoused by groups like al-Qaeda.

Osama bin Laden, al-Qaeda's leader, and other Arab militants have given several reasons for declaring a *jihad* against the United States. High on their list is the belief that the United States has "colonized" the Arab world to protect the U.S. access to oil. In particular, bin Laden

has expressed outrage at the presence of American troops in Saudi Arabia, the birthplace of the Prophet Muhammad. The U.S. forces remained in Saudi Arabia after the 1991 Gulf War to deter Iraq from attacking the oil-rich country.

The extremists also have accused the United States of supporting authoritarian governments in the Middle East while promoting democracy elsewhere, of helping oppress the Palestinians by backing Israel. Behind the attacks against the United States lies an effort by Muslim extremists to foment a wider Islamist revolution and topple more secular Arab rulers, Middle East observers say. Many Arab Islamists have been killed, tortured, jailed, or banished by the authoritarian governments that rule their home countries—both for attacking the West and for trying to create Islamist states to supplant regimes that the extremists consider corrupt and non-believing.

The primary goal of most of these Islamic radicals was to seize power at home, something they failed to do. Now these extremists are waging attacks against the United States to discredit these oppressive regimes and gain new followers.”¹⁸

Terrorism's defeat only occurs upon the removal its causes: Oppression, greed, apartheid, ethnic cleansing, occupation, colonization, conquest and invasion, not the leaves, flower or seeds illustrated by the people.

More specifically, the real reasons for al-Qaeda's attacks on the U.S. and on the U.S. interests overseas are twofold and actually quite simple: they resent the U.S. government's financial and military support for Israel, and they resent the presence of the U.S. military bases on Arab land.

¹⁸ Michael Scott Doran, a professor of Near Eastern studies at Princeton University.

Let's examine each of these concerns, and then look at some possible solutions to both.

First, the U.S. government's large-scale support for Israel, which ultimately funds and equips the Zionist movement, is a curious policy, considering that a 2005 survey by the University of Chicago found that only 1.7 percent of U.S. citizens described themselves as Jewish and also considering that a sizeable percentage of the Jewish American population does not subscribe to the Zionist agenda. According to a report by the Council on Foreign Relations, Israel is the number-one recipient of American foreign aid, receiving some \$2.1 billion in military financing and \$600 million in economic aid per year. As long as the U.S. persists in its direct or indirect support of Israeli aggression against innocent Palestinian civilians in the West Bank and Gaza Strip, the Arab world will continue to perceive the U.S. as a hostile enemy force.

Second, Islamic extremists disapprove of the proliferation of the U.S. military bases on their "holy ground." They see it as a show of anti-Arab support for Israel and greed for Arab oil.

There is one overriding conclusion that I would draw. The factors that are clearly within the power of the United States and its allies to alter are the political-economic ones. In my view, a win-win-win-win strategy today for the United States economically, environmentally, militarily, and ethnically would be to assume that the hypothesis that politico-economic macro factors do help to promote terrorism is correct. The United States and other rich nations should then move as rapidly as possible towards an energy-efficient economy that minimizes dependence on oil and coal, while putting much more effort into limiting wasteful resource consumption and closing the rich-poor gap.

Do Socioeconomic Factors generate terrorism?

In this part of the chapter I would like to draw attention to persistent socioeconomic factors that create the weakness that can possibly motivate this sort of terrorism and make it easier to recruit terrorists. I would like to emphasize that I do not consider these socioeconomic factors to be the only determinants of terrorism and I am not sure as well, whether they are the main determinants of terrorism. But they are ones that can be measured, at least in theory, to help to ameliorate. Some indicators of socioeconomic conditions possibly conducive to creating terrorists are summarized in Table 1. Poverty, especially because of its severely unequal distribution among nations, is obviously one of the most important. It has been claimed that Islamic rage against The United States is caused in part by the relative failure of Islamic nations to achieve economic success¹⁹.

In addition to the level and distribution of income, gender equity, public health, education, and exposure to violence are included. As can be seen from Table 1, on average there is a substantial gap in all of these indicators between these samples of developing countries (the vast majority with substantial Muslim populations) and developed countries, with only a few overlaps. The relationship of population growth rates to political instability is both important and complex. One often-neglected issue is the age composition of population, which interacts with poverty and the other factors in Table 1.

Job opportunities for the disproportionate numbers of young men in poor economies are relatively scarce. But high population growth rates are expected to continue in many developing nations, with a projected annual growth rate for people aged 20-34 of 2.82% as opposed to a rate of 0.16% in developed countries during the years 2000-2050.

¹⁹November issue of Population and Environment, Jianguo "Jack" Liu of Michigan State University

In the face of such growth, job opportunities may be doomed to become much rarer. And large numbers of unemployed, disaffected young men, who see the West as their enemy, provide the cannon fodder for terrorism.

Table1
Socioeconomic Indicators of Selected Countries*

Nations	PPPT_L 10%	Gender Equity	Life expectancy and fertility rate	Knowledge	Peace & Order
Less Developed Countries					
Afghanistan	-----	14	9	8	4
Comoros	-----	46	24	8	40
Egypt	1522	30	45	49	78
Kenya	182	39	20	14	35
Kuwait	-----	27	55	52	37
Lebanon	-----	40	53	59	19
Libya	-----	58	36	54	40
Pakistan	763	28	21	13	17
Saudi Arabia	-----	36	16	38	21
Tanzania	140	46	16	6	63
Average	652	39	32	33	39
More Developed Countries					
Canada	7123	66	86	95	72
France	6446	59	88	86	69
Germany	7758	66	83	85	75
Japan	12082	44	91	93	92
Italy	7700	53	87	84	79
Norway	11537	74	85	91	77
United States	5744	58	82	94	58
Average	8341	60	86	90	75

* Larger numbers mean better conditions

a) The average purchasing power parity (US Dollars) per capita in the group with lowest 10% share of income consumption. PPPT_L 10% was calculated based on the data from World Development Report of the World Bank and World Population Data sheet of the Population Reference Bureau.

b) The average of three not weighted indicators (gender and wealth, gender and knowledge, and gender and

community)

c) The lower of healthy life expectancy index at birth and an index of total fertility rate.

d) The average of two weighted indicators of education (school enrollment) and communication (telephone and internet use).

e) The average of two outweighed indicators (peace and crime).²⁰

Disparities in population growth rates among different peoples like ethnic groups may also exacerbate the conditions that breed terrorism. If this is correct, however, without dramatic action the demographic action and socioeconomic conditions in the selected Islamic nations in the Middle East and South Central Asia could continue to generate terrorism and terrorists in many decades to come.

After September 11 attacks, much of the political and media debate on terrorism has focused on prevention policies. The wide spread view that poverty creates terrorism has dominated much of this debate.²¹

As terrorism is a manifestation of political conflict, these results seem to indicate that poverty and adverse economic conditions may play an important role explaining terrorism. Certain persistent socioeconomic and demographic factors seem to help create this kind of terrorism and make it easier to recruit terrorists.

So, let's find out whether widespread poverty is one of the most important reasons for terrorism, as many people consider poverty as the main factor, which causes terror, especially because of the severely unequal distribution of wealth between and within nations. Others include a lack of gender equity; substandard public health, education and communication capabilities; and frequent exposure to violence.

In this report, I examined social indicators in a sample of developing countries that seem likely sources of terrorists, the majority of which contained substantial Muslim populations.

²⁰United Population Division, 2005

²¹See, for example, Kahn and Weiner

The socioeconomic and political conditions in their nations provided a good basis for both moral indignation and grassroots support. And sadly, what projections can be made give little hope that this salient set of socioeconomic differences between the developing and developed nations in our sample will be substantially reduced in the future.

For example, population growth projections indicate that the economies of Saudi Arabia, Pakistan, Afghanistan and Egypt will need to grow by about 100 percent, 75 percent, 70 percent and 40 percent, respectively, in the next quarter century just to keep per capita purchasing power from falling.²² Furthermore, the very strictness of religious fundamentalism makes many people in these countries extremely resistant to change and promotes a willingness to die for beliefs. A former president of the World Trade Organization, the current British Chancellor of the Exchequer, the House of Bishops of the Episcopal Church, and many others have claimed without citing any evidence a close connection between poverty and terrorism.²³

There are a host of other factors over and above the issue of poverty that come into play in the breeding of terrorism.

Harvard economist Alberto Abadie has recently studied both terrorism within a country and transnational terrorism for almost 200 nations. He estimates the poverty-terror relation after controlling for the degree of political freedom, religious and ethnic heterogeneity, and other variables. He finds little net relation between the degree of terrorism and poverty, where poverty is measured by per capita GDP, the degree of inequality within a country, and a couple of other ways.²⁴

²²NBER Working Paper No. 10859.

²³See, e.g. Abadie and Gardeazabal, 2003; Frey, Luechinger and Stutzer and Enders, 2005

²⁴Alberto Abadie, scholar, professor of public policy at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, the author of a study entitled "Poverty, Political Freedom, and the Roots of Terrorism."

Abadie finds these connections as well as an important relation between terrorism and the degree of freedom. Countries with the greatest political freedom, such as Western Europe, The United States, and Japan generally have relatively little terrorism, although a number of exceptions include German Baader-Meinhof terrorists and Italian Red Brigades. Highly oppressive regimes effectively deter terrorism by close surveillance of their populations, and by severe punishments to apprehended members of terrorist groups.

As a result, countries in the middle ranges of political rights usually suffer the most from terrorism, perhaps because these countries are in political transition, with considerable disorganization and conflict. Recruits with good economic opportunities would only be willing to undertake suicide missions that have a relatively high likelihood of destroying some enemies too. For they would not be willing to go on missions that have little chance of succeeding since they would then prefer safer terrorist activities, or doing well economically while working peacefully.

Poverty serves as an excellent ground for recruitment, but other factors must be present. If one examines the political situations of failing states and former communist countries that are in a transition to democracy, one may find many terrorist organizations in operation there.

Terrorists can set up schooling, social services, recruitment campaigns, etc. to spread ideology and attract followers, be they active terrorist agents or passive supporters.

So, wherever there is weak governmental control, terrorists can set up camp and create a flourishing base of operations. Often individuals who are in serious financial crisis are too concerned with day-to-day activities related to supporting themselves and their families to engage in sophisticated and often expensive terrorist acts. Thus, terrorists provide uneducated people with their own particular worldview, creating more and more sympathetic adherents to

their ideology. Poverty allows for terrorist organizations to inculcate ideas into people's minds so that they will eventually join their ranks.

In the above given survey I have defined the meanings and causes of terrorism and next chapter explores the problem of terrorism as a whole in the broader national and international security context. It takes as its point of analyses of terrorism threats and implications in the global scale. Although the goals, objectives, victims, tools of implementation, locations and justifications for terrorism have changed over history, the methods used have remained the same. And regardless of varieties of terrorist dimensions and origins such as political, religious or socio-economic, its threats are equally dangerous to all countries.

CHAPTER III CHAPTER III TERRORISM'S IMPLICATONS AND THREATS

FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND STABILITY

Conclusions and the model of analysis of terrorist influential factors.

Terrorism has been justified by political and secular logic justifications. Over the past 200 years, terrorism has developed from a tool of religious zealots, to a tool for consolidation of governmental power, to a tool used by anarchists to bring down governments, to a tool to unify a society, to a tool for liberation, to a tool of the Cold War, and in the last decade of the twentieth century, to a political tool.

The history of the past two hundred years defines terrorism as the utilization of terror in order to change behavior. This basic understanding of terrorism does not change according to the stated goals of the terrorist. A terrorist selects a target to cause fear in the larger society and inflicts terror on a society to force political, social, and ideological change. The user of terror can seek freedom, to solidify governmental power, or to achieve international objectives. It's the tactics, not the objective, which define a terrorist.

Clearly, terrorism is important when there are political, ethnic, religious, and other conflicts between groups. Jewish terrorist organizations attacked the British army in Palestine, the Tamils oppose the Sinhalese and Moslems in Sri Lanka, the Moslems and Hindus of India and Pakistan continue to battle, the IRA has attacked both the British and Protestants in Northern Ireland, and so on for many other examples. The enquiries in the United States into the performance of the intelligence community in the months preceding September 11 uncovered both specific shortcomings and systemic weaknesses in intelligence performance and have led to the major finding that the new indiscriminate terrorism with political, religious and socio-economic reasons, poses a major threat not only to the United States and its presence abroad and to the national security of individual nations, but to regional and international peace and

security.

In the wake of September 11th the United States joined by its NATO Allies and others has shown an unprecedented resolve in the efforts to combat international terrorism and bring those responsible for these terrible acts to justice in this regard a broad international coalition has been formed. The UN Security Council has stated that international terrorism is a threat to international peace and security, and confirmed the right of the United States to individual and collective self-defense. NATO declared the attacks of September 11th to be an attack on the Alliance as a whole.²⁵ Grievous incidents recorded in recent years in such disparate places as Paris, Jerusalem, Oklahoma City, Algiers, Dhahran, Lima, Karachi, Nairobi, Dar-es-Salaam, New York City, Washington D.C., Bali, Djerba, Casablanca, Riyadh, Istanbul, and Madrid – accompanied elsewhere by a myriad of less serious ones– dramatically confirm that in the twenty-first century, no country, society, or community is immune to terrorism.²⁶

²⁵On the details of the abrogation of the *jus ad bellum* and the development of modern international law see the author's analysis "The development of international law and the prohibition of the use of force in the 20th century," in: Hans Koechler, *Global Justice or Global Revenge? International Criminal Justice at the Crossroads*. Vienna/New York: Springer-Verlag, 2004, pp. 279-290.

²⁶On 12 September 2001, the UN General Assembly, by consensus of the 189 member states, had called for international cooperation to prevent and eradicate acts of terrorism and to hold accountable the perpetrators of terrorism and those who harbor or support them. The same day, the Security Council unanimously determined, for the first time ever, any act of international terrorism to be a threat to international peace and security. This determination laid the foundation for Security Council action to bring together the international community under a common set of obligations in the fight to end international terrorism. On 28 September 2001, the Security Council unanimously adopted resolution 1373 under chapter VII of the UN Charter. This established a body of legally binding obligations on all member states. Its provisions require, among other things, that all member states prevent the financing of terrorism and deny safe haven to terrorists. States were asked to review and strengthen their border security operations, banking practices, customs and immigration procedures, law enforcement and intelligence cooperation, and arms transfer controls. All states are required to increase cooperation and share

information with respect to these efforts. The Resolution also called upon each state to report on the steps it had taken, and established a committee of the Security Council to monitor implementation. In October 2002, The Global Program against Terrorism was launched as a framework for UNODC's operational activities working through technical assistance projects on Strengthening the Legal Regime against Terrorism. The UN Office on Drugs and Crime is committed to deliver tailor made assistance through: (1) reviewing domestic legislation and providing advice on drafting enabling laws; (2) facilitating and providing training to national administrations with regard to new legislation; (3) providing in-depth assistance on the implementation of the new legislation against terrorism through the mentorship program; and (4) maintaining a roster of experts to supplement specific expertise where required. See <http://www.undoc.org/undoc/en/terrorism.html>.

The terrorists' fanaticism and willingness to cause indiscriminate destruction, their disregard for human life - including their own, make the potential scale of the harm caused by their attacks unprecedented and nearly unlimited range of tools can be used as weapons in the hands of terrorists. The distinction between state and non-state actors has become blurred and the relationship between the Taliban and Al-Qaeda in Afghanistan is a case in point. And the last factor is that today people are living in societies that are rapidly becoming more and more interdependent and integrated - in all respects. Modern means of transport and communication are eliminating the barriers of time and distance and even if they provide great benefits to many, at the same time they increase our vulnerability and help terrorists get the upper hand.

In short, the new threat of international terrorism comes from advanced networks that have the intention - as well as the capacity - to strike on an unprecedented scale, and at any one of our open societies.

Although neither being the sole reason nor any excuse for terrorism, poverty and oppression breed fundamentalism and extremism. Similarly the lawlessness and lack of state authority in so-called "failed states" make them safe havens for terrorists. Poverty alleviation, good governance and conflict resolution are therefore important tools in the long-term fight against international terrorism.

The United Nations Organization represented international terrorism, in the context of highly complex and increasingly global networks which constitutes an entirely new challenge to the system of collective security. By its very nature, trans-border terrorism cannot exclusively be dealt with within the framework of an international order defined by the nation-state. Naturally, effective strategies cannot be developed by states in isolation from each other. Except in cases of state terrorism, where specific state responsibility can be established,

governmental authorities cannot automatically be held accountable for terrorist acts originating from their territory.

To a certain extent, the new brand of international terrorism referred to above, in the form of regional and transcontinental networks, is also a phenomenon of globalization. This kind of terrorism not only exploits the global availability of information infrastructure for its own logistical purposes, but also makes use of it for political mobilization.

The security of states of the world is affected, in different ways, by traditional threats and the following new threats, concerns, and other challenges of a diverse nature as terrorism, transnational organized crime, the global drug problem, corruption, asset laundering, illicit trafficking in weapons, and the connections among them. Other factors as extreme poverty and social exclusion of broad sectors of the population, which also affect stability and democracy cause the threat to international peace and stability. Extreme poverty erodes social cohesion and undermines the security of states, as well as possibility of access, possession, and use of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery by terrorists. Many of the most serious terrorist risks to international security above all, those of risks, is especially striking in Europe and U.S. with the weakening of borders and security problems linked to immigration.

The most dramatic and proximate source of risk arises from direct terrorist attacks against the U.S. citizens and property, overseas or on U.S. territory or against U.S. forces in peacetime. The United States has been a leading target of international terrorists, a trend that shows few signs of abating. The rise of terrorist networks blurs the distinction between domestic and international terrorism, and could facilitate the use of amateur proxies, including self-appointed proxies, for attacks within country borders. Terrorist groups have already found the United

States to be a fertile environment for fundraising and associated political activities. Some of this infrastructure could also be used to support more violent activities.

A given perspective focuses on the overall consequences of terrorism, worldwide and domestic, for the international security environment and the U.S. global engagement. Terrorist acts associated with international causes and Western targets claim the lion's share of media attention and policymakers' concern, but the vast bulk of terrorism worldwide is contained within state borders and is local in character. Factional terrorism in Algeria has probably claimed over 80,000 lives since 1992, and multiple incidents with as many as 100 deaths each continue to occur on a weekly basis. In Northern Ireland alone, deaths from domestic terrorism in some years have been four times the number of deaths from international terrorism in Europe as a whole.²⁷ If one includes the ethnic terrorism in sub-Saharan Africa, the Balkans, and the Caucasus, it becomes clear that terrorism's global toll in lives, property, and stability is larger indeed.

Mass terrorism in Central Africa may be held at arm's length in Western perceptions. But even smaller-scale instances of ethnic terror in the Balkans, the Caucasus, or elsewhere in the former Soviet Union or China could significantly affect the strategic evolution of these regions.

All above discussed types of terrorism as political, religious and poverty terrorism, pose a threat to all countries' interests, from homeland defense to regional security and the stability of the international system. The group of efforts to diminish the underlying causes of terrorism composes the third element of the strategy of abolishing terrorism as an instrument of change.

²⁷There were, for example, 62 in 1989. Paul Wilkinson, "Terrorist Targets and Tactics: New Risks to World Order," in Alison Jamieson (ed.), "Terrorism and Drug Trafficking in the 1990s", Research Institute for the Study of Conflict and Terrorism, Aldershot, Dartmouth, UK, 1994, p. 9.

Through an aggressive long-term campaign, the international community should mitigate the underlying conditions that foster the formation of terrorist groups and their support elements. To do this, the international community should directly or indirectly engage vulnerable regions and disparate ideologies and peoples. The major contributors to the underlying causes of terrorism could be seen as economic and social inequality in societies marked by both abject poverty and conspicuous affluence, poor governance and economic stagnation or decline that alienates many segments of a state's population, illiteracy and lack of education that lead to widespread ignorance about the modern world and resentment toward Western values and the U.S. and Western foreign policies, particularly regarding the Middle East, that have caused widespread resentment toward America and the West.

As a global power, the U.S. perspective on terrorism is bound to differ in substantial ways from that of others, including allies such as Britain, France, and Israel, whose experiences provide lessons, but not necessarily direction, for the U.S. counterterrorism policy. In light of the preceding analysis, certain overall conclusions stand out:

Firstly, Terrorism is becoming a more diverse and more lethal problem as contemporary terrorism occupies an expanded place on the conflict spectrum, from connections to drug trafficking and crime to its use as an “asymmetric strategy” by state and non-state adversaries in a war paradigm. For a variety of reasons, primarily the rise of religious and millenarian groups with transcendent agendas but also the hardening of established political groups, terrorism has become more lethal destruction, lethality could increase dramatically.

Secondly, industrialized powers worried about terrorism should be concerned about narrowing the gap between rich and poor as recent experience shows that there are certain conditions favorable to terrorists and their cause, including a lack of economic opportunity, underemployment, isolation and a lack of strong governing institutions. The failure of globalization in the short run to deliver broad-based benefits to large parts of the developing

world contributes to the picture painted by militants of the wealthier nations as self-centered.

Thirdly, the geopolitics of terrorism is changing. For example, over the next decades, the prevailing image of terrorism affecting the U.S. interests as a problem emanating largely from the Middle East is likely to be overtaken by a more diverse set of risks. The Balkans, the former Soviet Union, and Latin America are set to emerge as significant sources of terrorism aimed at or affecting U.S. civilian and military activities. Moreover, the vast bulk of global terrorism will continue to be confined within the borders of affected states.

Since the terrorist attacks in the United States on September 11, 2001, it was reconfirmed that terrorism, in all its variations, is a major threat to the peace and security of the international community as a whole and the international community has strengthened its solidarity in the fight against terrorism. As a result of enhancing such international efforts, results have been achieved in Afghanistan such as the destruction of training camps that cultivate terrorists and detainment of many Al-Qaeda members. Furthermore, although the remaining Al-Qaeda forces in and around Afghanistan have not been completely eliminated, Al-Qaeda members are being detected and detained in various parts of the world with the cooperation of various law enforcement authorities. As such, the threat of terrorism by terrorist organizations such as Al-Qaeda and other terrorist groups is still serious, and it is necessary for the international community to continue to be united for the purpose of preventing and eradicating terrorism and maintain its endeavors over the long term on a wide range of fronts.

As for the implications for the international system, they will be defined by two sets of factors. The first lies within the psychological realm: how dramatically and seriously will new challenges be assessed? The second concerns politics: how can the new developments affect patterns of interaction in the world arena and, accordingly, their structural characteristics?

The struggle against terrorism might increasingly be given priority over the other international tasks of states. The traditional approach, with its focus on state interests and the

maximization of state influence against a background of competition with other international actors, will probably continue as the predominant factor of international developments for some time to come. The erosion of this inertia might be commensurate with the understanding that the very institution of the state is under threat, with prospects of chaos and unpredictable consequences.

The logic of “protecting the state” from dangerous external influences might become more salient, including toughening border protection, limiting migration flows, controlling emigrants, regulating flows of information and so on. If this happens, the degree of “openness” of states will decrease. There might be increasing informational, operational and strategic interactions among states’ special services. The process will certainly develop slowly and within certain limits as it touches upon areas of extreme sensitivity. However, the very fact of cooperative interaction in such sensitive areas may bring a new qualitative characteristic to international relations.

The forceful US reaction to the terrorist attack might become a model for other states’ behavior under circumstances that they consider threatening to their vital. In a broader sense, there are reasons to expect a lowering of the political and psychological barriers preventing the use of force. The ongoing developments could result in an erosion of international law and expectations with respect to the United Nations. All these trends could make the international system more unbalanced and vulnerable to crisis. The task of ensuring its manageability may become even more demanding than it is today.

Many developing countries might feel uneasy about the possibility of the struggle against international terrorism being projected onto their territories. This might lead to their focusing on international law and the non-violability of sovereignty.

The debate on globalization will obviously be affected as well. One can expect growing attention to its fundamental problem that is the increasing gap between the center and the

periphery in the world system – a gap that creates the conditions for international terrorism.

In a paradoxical way, the terrorist attacks could have painful implications for NATO. It has turned out to be irrelevant for responding to new security challenges in terms of its functional specificity, organization, structure and operational mode. The considerable implications of the phenomenon of terrorism notwithstanding, some important lines of international political development will hardly be directly affected. Thus, the emergence of new power poles, such as China and India, as well as the rapid and impetuous evolution of the world of Islam will continue to generate their own dynamics in the international arena.

It should be fairly obvious from the preceding discussion that al-Qaeda and its affiliates constitute a particularly intractable and dangerous challenge to governments and the international community.

Unfortunately, there are many deep-rooted conflicts, which seem stubbornly incorrigible, for example between the Israelis and the Palestinians and the Indians and Pakistanis. In these situations terrorism not only helps polarize the conflict. In both of these cases terrorist attacks could all too swiftly escalate into full-scale wider inter-state war with a significant risk that weapons of mass destruction could be used by the belligerents.

Many of national states high-priority objectives have been shaken by the recent experience of terrorism. The Oklahoma and the World Trade Center bombings struck at human sense of security within borders. Attacks against the U.S. forces in Saudi Arabia raise questions about world strategy for presence and stability in an area of critical importance for world energy supply. The U.S. embassy bombings in Kenya and Tanzania raise questions about the exposure that comes with active engagement in world affairs, and point to the risks of privately sponsored terrorism. Elsewhere, terrorism has destabilized allies, for example in Egypt and Turkey, and has rendered counter narcotics relationships difficult in countries like Colombia

and Mexico. Where societies and regions are fundamentally unstable, and where political outcomes are delicately poised, terrorism will have a particular ability to affect strategic futures.

This new terrorism is increasingly networked; more diverse in terms of motivations, sponsorship, and security consequences; more global in reach; and more lethal. There will be a continuing need for preemption, deterrence, and retaliation in relation to state sponsors. But the key tasks for air and space power in the future may have as much or more to do with the surveillance, exposure, and targeting of non-state actors, and even individuals.

The transforming contribution of air and space power to national counterterrorism strategy will be making terrorism—an inherently amorphous phenomenon—more transparent for policymakers and the international community.

Next sub-chapter offers some counterterrorism strategies to be taken by international community to fight spread terrorism.

Counterterrorism Policies and Strategies

The security of a nation has always been and continues to be, quite correctly, a very sensitive national issue: it is one of the pillars of national sovereignty. It also is a matter of major political importance. After all, in most countries, the majority of the population – the law-abiding citizens – looks to their government to provide a safe and secure environment in which they can go about their normal daily business. Most people in most countries would prefer to live in an environment in which business and enterprise can flourish, leading to a healthy economy, a reasonable standard of living, and a future for themselves and their families. They, the majority, would also prefer their societies be free from the threats posed by criminals, be they petty thieves or organized gangs, and more importantly, the threats posed by terrorists, domestic or otherwise. It is the feeling of insecurity engendered by acts of terrorism

that the terrorists exploit terror itself being such a “cost-effective weapon.

There are many facets to combating terrorism, involving a variety of agencies, and these have to be well coordinated if nation-states are to provide their citizens and those of other countries with a safe and secure environment in which to live and in which their economies can flourish.

Furthermore, combating transnational terrorism, of the type espoused by Osama bin Laden and associated with Al Qaeda and the evolving ideology, and also other causing threats to international security and peace terrorist organizations require a comprehensive and concerted effort on the part of many countries. No one nation alone is going to defeat this scourge that currently threatens global peace and security, no matter how big and strong that country might be.

Efforts to disrupt and destroy terrorist organizations occur in many ways: diplomacy in bilateral and multilateral for law enforcement efforts to investigate, arrest, and prosecute terrorists; financial and other measures to eliminate terrorist support.

Most existing strategies contain comparable content to the U.S. National Strategy for Combating Terrorism, which claims leadership in the worldwide effort and is the most offensively oriented. For the United States, the best defense is an aggressive offense, in which traditional counterterrorism, antiterrorism, intelligence collection, and covert action are seamlessly integrated. All strategies seek to create a global environment hostile to all terrorist groups, whether they operate globally, regionally, or within the boundaries of a single state. They provide guidance to orchestrate all instruments of national power while coordinating the collective efforts of the international community. The end state of the strategies is invariably a world free of terrorism as an instrument of societal change and a global environment in which terrorism can not flourish again. Terrorism has been of concern to the international community since 1937, when the League of Nations elaborated the Convention for the Prevention and

Punishment of Terrorism. Subsequently, the UN and other intergovernmental organizations have dealt with terrorism from a legal and political perspective. Since 1963, the international community has elaborated twelve universal legal instruments related to the prevention of international terrorism, many initiated by the United States. Regional organizations such as NATO, the EU, OSCE, SAARC, and ASEAN have made counterterrorism a principal concern. And organizations such as the Shanghai Cooperation Organization have provided guidance and cooperation.²⁸

Since the fight against terrorism requires a multidimensional, multinational approach aimed at the entire spectrum of terrorism, the strategies call upon states, international and regional organizations, private and public entities, and individuals to collaborate in combating terrorism at all levels simultaneously.

The UN should lead the effort while facilitating regional responses and assisting individual partner states. The goal is to reduce terrorism to a level at which it can be combated as mere crime. All strategies place primary responsibility on sovereign states that have jurisdiction over terrorist activities within their borders.

Many states are well equipped to combat terrorism. Others are weak and require assistance. A few are ambivalent or reluctant and require motivation.

Some states still support or sponsor terrorists and must be compelled to stop. Thus the UN, NATO, and the EU, as well as the United States encourage all societies to pool diplomatic, informational, military, and economic capabilities to defeat terrorist organizations wherever they exist, deter future acts of terrorism, and ultimately diminish the underlying causes of terrorism through a concerted effort at the global, regional, and sovereign-state levels.

²⁸Issued by the UN, NATO, the European Council in May 2004, and other international and regional organizations as well as by individual states.

At the same time, individual states are called upon to provide defense for their citizens at home and abroad.

The first element of combating terrorism as an instrument of change aims at defeating existing terrorist organizations at the global, regional, and state levels. Terrorism will only be defeated by solidarity and collective action²⁹. Through direct and indirect use of diplomatic, informational, military, and economic instruments of power, the international community should seek to defeat terrorist organizations by attacking their “centers of gravity,” while directly compelling or indirectly influencing states that sponsor terrorists. The centers of gravity of terrorist groups include leadership, supporting ideology, finances, command and control networks, and sanctuaries.

To defeat existing terrorist groups, the UN and the United States, its allies, and coalition partners need to: a) identify and isolate terrorist organizations at each level; b) disrupt support infrastructure and sanctuaries; c) discredit ideology or reasons for committing acts of terrorism d) destroy networks and leadership.

While it is unrealistic to hope to eliminate every single terrorist who desires to threaten innocent individuals, it is possible to eliminate the synergy created by the cooperation of disparate terrorist organizations.

This effort will reduce the operational scope and capabilities of global and regional terrorists to the point that they become threats only at the individual state level. At that level, the threat can be combated as criminal behavior, which will allow for a narrower focus of attack and enable the full engagement of law enforcement mechanisms.

The second element of the strategy focuses on deterring future acts of terrorism.

²⁹ European Council Declaration on Combating Terrorism, May 2004.

To establish a credible deterrent, the international community should develop and maintain a set of capabilities and mechanisms that clearly communicate to potential terrorists and their supporters that their costs will far outweigh any perceived benefits of engaging in terrorism.

The deterrence message should be sent not only to terrorist organizations but also to states that sponsor them, non-state actors that provide a front for their activities, and individuals who may contemplate joining or supporting them. The goal of deterring terrorism supports the strategic aim of abolishing terrorism by convincing individuals, organizations, and states to seek alternative methods of political change because terrorism is no longer a viable option.

Providing a deterrent message to each of the four audiences associated with terrorism requires deterring terrorist organizations who believe that they can conduct operations with impunity. Capabilities, particularly improved intelligence, should be acquired to detect, thwart, and destroy such groups and bring their members to justice. Actions should be taken to create the certainty that terrorists will be captured and imprisoned rather than becoming martyrs for their cause. Political, social, and religious leaders must understand that their organizations will be destroyed if they choose terrorism to advance their aims.

While deterring state actors, states must be deterred from providing support or sanctuary to terrorist organizations. This can be done by broadening international norms against terrorism and demonstrating the resolve to replace the leadership of any state that continues to sponsor terrorism. States must clearly understand that the costs will far outweigh any perceived benefits of engaging in acts of terrorism.

And deterring non-state actors, non-state actors must be deterred from providing aid and assistance to terrorist organizations. This can be achieved by establishing an international environment of greater financial transparency, naming and shaming organizations involved in

terrorist support, and lowering the barriers to asset seizures and freezing of funds.

Efforts to deter individuals from joining or supporting terrorist organizations include educating potential recruits on the sinister nature of specific organizations and of terrorism in general, dispelling the notion that terrorism results in positive gain, and demonstrating that terrorists will be brought to justice.

State and non-state actors can be deterred from providing assistance. The tougher challenge applies to the actual terrorist organizations and their followers. Deterrence of these will take time. The bottom line is that terrorists must believe that ultimately their efforts would be futile.

States should remain vigilant and ready by establishing collaborative relationships between the ministries, the agencies, law enforcement, public health and emergency management entities, professional associations, and private partners. To that end, states should use every power available to defend their citizens against terrorist attack. States should be postured to provide an effective defense in three areas, first of all within their own territory. One of them is to prevent terrorist attacks. To the maximum extent possible, would be terrorists and the weapons they intend to use must be denied entry into the country. Weapons of mass destruction must be detected and intercepted before they can be employed.

Second is to protect critical assets. To minimize the probability of a successful terrorist strike, states should harden critical infrastructure and other potential terrorist targets. And prepare responses. To reduce the effect of terrorism, states should be prepared to mitigate the consequences of an attack. This is particularly critical when responding to attacks from weapons of mass destruction. States should be safe and secure at home to preserve the way of life, maintain economic growth and stamina, and remain engaged in the international effort against terrorism. However, while there are strategies that contain the essence for combating terrorism, the strategies by themselves, no matter how cohesive and comprehensive, will not

ensure an integrated and effective set of programs to combat terrorism.

Defeat terrorist organizations of global reach by attacking their sanctuaries; leadership, command, control, and communications; material support; and finances; deny sponsorship, support, and sanctuary to terrorists; diminish the underlying conditions that promote despair and lead people to embrace terrorism.

These are the most important strategies that should be taken into account by every state.

To conclude, terrorism is one of the most widespread violent means used today to achieve political objectives, both locally and internationally. As such it would appear that this phenomenon will continue to trouble human history in the foreseeable future. Only broad international agreement on the nature of the phenomenon, the scale of the threat, together with the steps required to thwart it and punish its perpetrations and their supporters, will enable the countries of the world to fight terrorism effectively and to minimize its influence.

The List Of Foreign Terrorist Organizations	
1	Abu Nidal Organization (ANO) – Iraq, also present in the Bekaa Valley of Lebanon as well as in several refugee camps along the coast of Lebanon. Limited presence in Sudan and Syria.
2	Abu Sayyaf Group – Philippines and has expanded its operations to Malaysia.
3	Al-Aqsa Martyrs Brigade – West Bank and Israel and the Gaza strip.
4	Armed Islamic Group – Algeria.
5	Asbat al-Ansar- Southern Lebanon.
6	Aum Shinrikyo – Operates in Japan but is present in Australia, Russia, UK, Germany, Taiwan, Sri Lanka, former Yugoslavia, and U.S.
7	Basque Fatherland and liberty (ETA)- Northern Spain and South-Western France.
8	Gama'a al-Islamiyya (Islamic Group) – Egypt but also has a presence in Sudan, Afghanistan, Austria, and Yemen.
9	HAMAS (Islamic Resistance Movement) – Israel and Western Bank settlements.
10	Harakat ul-Mujahidin (HUM) – Pakistan but conducts attacks mainly in Kashmir.
11	Hizballah – Lebanon, conducts operations in the West Bank and Israel and the Gaza strip.
12	Islamic Movement of Uzbekistan – Based in Tajikistan and Afghanistan but operates in Uzbekistan, Afghanistan, Kyrgyzstan, and Tajikistan
13	Janish-e- Mohammed (JEM) (Army of Mohammed) – Pakistan, but conduct attacks mainly in Kashmir.
14	al- Jihad (Egyptian Islamic Jihad) – Egypt, but is present in Yemen, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Sudan, Lebanon, ad UK.
15	Kahane Chai (Kach)- Israel and Western Bank settlements.
16	Kurdistan Worker's Party (PKK) – Turkey, Europe, and the Middle East.
17	Lashkar-e Tayyiba (LT) (Army of the Righteous)-Pakistan.
18	Lashkar I Jhangvi – Pakistan.
19	Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) – Sri Lanka.
20	Mujahedin-e Khalq Organization (MEK) –Based in Iraq but holds an extensive overseas network.
21	National Liberation Army (ELN)-Colombia and the southwest Colombia- Venezuela border.
22	Palestinian Islamic Jihad (PIJ) – Headquartered in Syria. Actions primarily in Israel and to a lesser degree in Jordan and Lebanon.
23	Plestinian Liberalization Front – Originally based Tunisia but currently located in Iraq.
24	Popular Front for the Liberalization of Palestine General Command

(PFLP-GC)- Headquartered in Syria. Active against Israel from camps based in Lebanon.
25. PFLP – General Command – Southern Lebanon and various parts of the Middle East and Western Europe.
26. Al-Qaeda- Key officials reside or have been known to reside in Afghanistan. The operation has a worldwide network in a number of countries.
27. Real IRA – Northern Ireland, Republic of Ireland, and other areas of Great Britain.
28. Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia (FARC) – Colombia with some activity in Venezuela, Panama, and Ecuador.
29 Revolutionary Nuclei (formerly ELA)-Athens, Greece.
30 Revolutionary Organization 17 November – Athens, Greece
31 Revolutionary People’s Liberation Army / Front (DHKP/C) - Turkey.
32 Salafist Group for Call and Combat (GSPC) - Algeria.
33 Shining Path (Sendero Luminoso) - Peru.
34 United Self-Defense Forces of Colombia (AUC) – Colombia
35 Communist Party of the Philippines / New People’s Army (CPP/NPA)-Philippines.
36 Jemaah Islamiya Organization (JI) - Southeast Asia.

Sources: Department of State, “Fact Sheet: Foreign Terrorist Organizations, January 30, 2003. Available online at: <http://www.state.gov/s/ct/rls/fs/2003/17067.htm>; Department of State, “Patterns of Global Terrorism ”, The International Policy institute for Counter- Terrorism, terrorist Organization Profiles,2002. Available online at www.ict.org.il.

References

- Anwar Syed, Dawn "Extremism, terrorism and fundamentalism," 2001
- Abdelkarim Benoit Evans "Terrorism is Political "2000
- Bruno S. Frey "Dealing with Terrorism – Stick or Carrot?" UK 2004
- Feldman, Noah 2003: After Jihad. "America and the Struggle for Islamic Democracy". New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Fish, Steven M. 2002: "Islam and Authoritarianism," World Politics, Vol. 55, No. 1: 4–37.
- Hudson, R. (1999). Who Becomes a Terrorist and Why: The 1999 Government Report on Profiling Terrorists.
- "Images of terror", National Bureau of Economic Research, Foreign Affairs. Vol. 82 #5 2003 Sept
- ipg Kitschelt, Origins of Terrorism 1/2004/ 187
- ipg Kitschelt, Origins of Terrorism 1/2004/188
- John Feffer "Power trip U.S. Unilateralism and Global Strategy after September 11. Seven Stories Press. New York, 2003
- Kepel, Giles 2002: Jihad. The Trail of Political Islam. Cambridge, Mass.: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Kitschelt, Herbert 2003: State Failure, Globalization, and Regime Conflict. Origins of Contemporary International Terrorism in the Middle East. Friedrich-Ebert-Foundation.
- Krueger A.B. and Maleckova. J. (2003) "Education, poverty and terrorism: Is there any casual connection" Journal of Economic Perspectives 17(4) 119-144.
- Kelly. R. and W. Cook (1995). "Extremism and fundamentalism: the return to paradise". Journal of Contemporary

Martha Crenshaw "Thoughts on Relating Terrorism to Historical Contexts."

Noam Chomsky "International Terrorism: Image and Reality" In Alexander George (ed.), *Western State Terrorism*, Routledge, December, 1991

Omer bin Abdullah "Reaching the Roots of Terrorism", Vol. 4, no. 4, July, 2003

Paul Wilinon, *Terrorism versus Democracy: The Liberal State Response*, Frank Class Publishers, 2001

Paul Wilkinson "Terrorism and the Liberal State," op cit, Chapter 13 'Potential Threats'
Walter Laqueur "The New Terrorism," London: Phoenix Press, 2001.

Paul R. Pillar "Terrorism and U.S. Foreign Policy" Brookings Institution Press Washington, D.C. 2001

Rashid, Ahmed 2002: *Jihad. "The Rise of Militant Islam in Central Asia"*. New Haven: Yale University Press

Rohan Gunaratna "Inside Al-Qaeda," London: CSTPV-Hurst Series on Political Violence, 2002, Chapter 2.

Steven Simon "The New Terrorism" National Bureau of Economic Research, Foreign Affairs Vol.2 #1, 2003.

Updated Indicators for 2004/5. The World Bank. Development Research Group. Policy Research Working Paper 2772

Violence and Terrorism 98/99, 4th ed. Guilford, CT: Annual Editions, pp. 64–72.

Washington DC: US Department of State, 2002, pp. 63-68 for a discussion of recent and current evidence of state sponsorship. *Patterns of Global Terrorism 2001*

Walter Laqueur "The Age of Terrorism," Boston: Little, Brown, 1987, and Paul Wilkinson "Terrorism and the Liberal State," second edition, Basingstoke: Macmillan Press, 1986, and the latter's "Terrorism Versus Democracy: The Liberal State response",

London: Frank Cass, 2000.

Wedgwood R. "Al-Qaeda, terrorism" Current issue Bureau of Economic Research, Foreign Affairs Vol. 99 #3, 2005

William J. Bennett "Why we fight" First Edition U.S. 2002

Yevgeniy M. Primakov "A World Challenged: Fighting Terrorism in 21st Century" The Nixon Center and Brookings Institution Press, Washington, D.C. 2004

LIST OF ACRONYMS

1. ASEAN	Association of South
2. EU	European Union
3. FBI	Federal Bureau of Investigation
4. NATO	The North Atlantic Treaty Organization
4. OSCE	Organization for Security and co-operation in Europe SAARC
5. SAARC	South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation
6. UN	United Nations
7. USSR	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
8. WTC	World Trade Center